IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE TWENTY FIFTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO : 15387 of 2004

Between:

B.Adilaxmamma W/o Nagaraju, R/o.
Garudapuram Village, Errampalli post, Kalyandurg Mandal,
Anantapur Distirct

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Revenue Divisional Officer Dharmavaram, Anantapur District
2 Mandal Revenue Officer, Kalyandurg, Anantapur District

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declare the action of the respondents in not canceling the temporary dealership of Kaveri Mahila Mandali, Garudapuram Village, Kalyandurg Mandal, Anantapur District, is arbitry and illegal and consequently direct the 1st respondent to release the stocks in favour of the petitioner.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.U.RAMANJANEYULU

Counsel for the Respondents1 and 2: GP FOR CIVIL SUPPLIES

The Court at the stage of admission made the following Order:

The petitioner claims to be the authorised dealer of the Fair Price Shop of Garudapuram Village, Kalyandurg Mandal. The petitioner states that she was appointed on 11-01-1994. However, due to ill-health, she was admitted in the Hospital and was under treatment till 31-05-2004. It appears that, in the interregnum, a society by name Kaveri Mahila Sangam was appointed, on temporary basis, as the dealer of the Fair Price Shop in question. The petitioner states that after her recovery, she made a representation to the first respondent-Revenue Divisional Officer, Dharmavaram, Anantapur District on 23-08-2004 requesting to release the stocks in her favour. It is stated that Kaveri Mahila Sangam also made a representation requesting the first respondent to release stocks in favour of the petitioner. However, the first respondent failed to consider their request. Hence, this writ petition.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for the respondents, without expressing any opinion with regard to the entitlement of the petitioner to continue as dealer, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the first respondent to consider the representation made by the petitioner dated 23-08-2004 and to pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of this order.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

_____

25-10-2004

kdl

To

1 The Revenue Divisional Officer Dharmavaram, Anantapur District
2 The Mandal Revenue Officer Kalyandurg, Anantapur District

3 Two C.Cs. to the Government Pleader for Civil Supplies, High Court Buildings, A.P., Hyderabad, (OUT).

4 Two C.D. Copies.